

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 7 are amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Abstract was objected to; Claims 1-3 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 1-3 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-3 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; and Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ogawa (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087706) in view of Skillen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,065, herein "Skillen") and Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,738, herein "Suzuki").

Regarding the objection to the Abstract, the Abstract has been amended to have no more than 150 words without adding new matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, independent Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite a computer program product stored on a tangible medium. It is noted that Figure 1 shows a service provision computer system that includes various components (for example a search engine 110, a procedure file 107, a ticket management unit 105, etc.) driven by instructions illustrated, for example, in Figures 2-5. In addition, Figure 1 shows a storage unit 1052 and the specification discloses at page 33, lines 24-26, that the storage unit 1052 stores a plurality of tickets and a procedure process executer 106 that performs procedures for the users of the system.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such a system that stores procedures is driven by a computer program product

stored on a tangible medium and the steps/instructions of the computer program product are shown in Figures 2-5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1 and 7 and each of the claims depending therefrom reasonably convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, independent Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite a computer program product stored on a tangible medium. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the above noted rejections because a computer program product stored on a tangible medium is statutory subject matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these rejections be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ogawa in view of Skillen and Suzuki is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a computer program product stored on a tangible medium that stores instructions that cause a computer system to provide, *inter alia*, a procedure file that stores access method information for connecting to a service, and to store and manage a plurality of tickets. Each ticket includes a first identifier given to a commodity, an access address of a service provider for providing a service related to the commodity, and storage location information of the procedure file.

As shown in a non-limiting example, Figures 16A-16C illustrate three tickets, each ticket including the first identifier ID given to a commodity (pet food) and each ticket including storage location information of the procedure file (Service Entity Access Protocol Storage Location Pointer).

The outstanding Office Action states at page 5, numbered paragraph 22, that Ogawa shows in Figure 5 “each ticket comprising a first identifier given to a commodity,” i.e., “mailname.” However, it is respectfully submitted that the term commodity, as disclosed in the specification and as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, refers to energy, goods, or services and the identifier “mailname” of Ogawa is merely a name for an email address and not a name for one of the above categories. In other words, the claimed commodity feature is different from the mailname element shown by Ogawa in Figure 5. Neither Skillen nor Suzuki teaches or suggests this feature missing in Ogawa.

In addition, the outstanding Office Action asserts in the same paragraph that Ogawa discloses that each ticket includes an URL of a service provider for providing a service related to the asserted commodity “mailname.” However, the URL provided in Figure 5 of Ogawa is not “related” to the “mailname” as required by Claims 1 and 7.

Further, the outstanding Office Action recognizes at page 7, numbered paragraph 28, that Ogawa and Skillen do not teach “providing a procedure file that stores access method information for connection to a service,” and “further including in the ticket, storage location information of the procedure file.” The outstanding Office Action relies on Suzuki for disclosing the above-noted features that lack in Ogawa and Skillen.

Suzuki is directed to a video information server system, which based on a common management file 13 shown in Figure 1, responds to various requests from plural terminals 16 by providing video information from plural video information service apparatuses 14 through a switching control mechanism 15 (see Suzuki at column 5, lines 14-20). In other words, Suzuki discloses that the user 16 sends a request to the central control apparatus 12 for certain video information and the central control apparatus 12, based on the common management file 13, identifies the necessary information from any of the video information service apparatuses 14 and provides that content to the user 16.

Therefore, Suzuki does not teach or suggest that each ticket of a plurality of tickets includes storage location information of the procedure file stored in the common management file 13, as required by independent Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10.

Although the outstanding Office Action asserts that Ogawa shows in Figure 5 a plurality of tickets, there is no indication in Ogawa that any of the asserted tickets stores location information of a procedure file that is stored in the common management file 13 of Suzuki. In this respect, Ogawa does not teach or suggest that the asserted tickets shown in Figure 5 require to store the location information of the procedure file or any other information except the information already shown in Figure 5.

To the contrary, from the description of Figure 5 in Ogawa at paragraphs [0125]-[0128], there is no indication that the contents table 317 should have other fields or information except the information already shown in Figure 5. In addition, the contents table 317 shown in Figure 5 of Ogawa is a simple database that stores information about a user, his ID, his email, and an URL of a collection page that is provided to the user as disclosed in paragraphs [0125]-[0127].

Also, it is noted that the contents table 317 shown in Figure 5 of Ogawa already shows both the email address of the user and the URL that will be shown to the user when the user desires a corresponding service and there is no need for a supplemental procedure file in Ogawa to connect the server to the user, as asserted by the outstanding Office Action.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10, and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Ogawa, Skillen, and Suzuki, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073
Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,140

BDL:RFF\pm
I:\atty\Rff\24s\240049US\240049us-af.doc